

Serial No. 09/874,837
Response dated June 8, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 9, 2005

Attorney Docket No. PF02193NA

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 14 remain in this application.

Claims 1 through 5 and 8 through 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,907,677 to Glenn, et al. ("Glenn, et al. patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,193,151 to Jain ("Jain patent") and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,805 to Bantum ("Bantum patent"). Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Glenn, et al. patent in view of the Jain patent in further view of Bantum patent and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,587,450 to Pasanen ("Pasanen patent"). Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Glenn, et al. patent in view of the Jain patent in further view of Bantum patent and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,712,587 to Schauder, et al. ("Schauder, et al. patent").

Claim 1 provides, *inter alia*, adjusting transmission timing of chat messages based on said link latency in order to synchronize communication of chat messages and claim 8 provides, *inter alia*, similar language.

Page 3, lines 12 and 13, of the above Office Action states that the Glenn, et al. patent and the Jain patent do not teach synchronized communication of messages, but the Bantum patent teaches synchronized communication of messages.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of the Bantum patent. The Bantum patent describes timer synchronization, i.e., synchronization of clocks, but does not

Serial No. 09/874,837
Response dated June 8, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 9, 2005

Attorney Docket No. PF02193NA

describe or suggest the synchronization of messages. In particular, the last sentence of the abstract of the Bantum patent states "[b]y calculating the difference between the client's own local time and the calculated local server time, a constant is derived which can be used to calculate local server time for any and all future client local times". Thus, the Bantum patent describes a way to synchronize client-based timers with a server-based timer. The Bantum patent does not describe or suggest synchronized communication of messages, let alone adjusting transmission timing of chat messages based on said link latency in order to synchronize communication of chat messages, as required by claims 1 and 8.

Likewise, the Pasanen patent and the Schauder, et al. patent do not describe or suggest adjusting transmission timing of chat messages based on said link latency in order to synchronize communication of chat messages, as required by claims 1 and 8. Therefore claims 1 and 8 distinguish patentably from the Glenn, et al. patent, the Jain patent, the Pasanen patent, the Schauder, et al. patent, the Bantum patent, and any combination of these patents.

Claims 2 through 7 and 9 through 14 depend from and include all limitations of independent claims 1 and 8, respectively. Therefore, claims 2 through 7 and 9 through 14 distinguish patentably from the Glenn, et al. patent, the Jain patent, the Pasanen patent, the Schauder, et al. patent, the Bantum patent, and any combination of these patents for the reasons stated above for claims 1 and 8.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of claims 1 through 14 are respectfully requested.

Serial No. 09/874,837
Response dated June 8, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 9, 2005

Attorney Docket No. PF02193NA

CONCLUSION


No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Phillips, W. Garland

Please forward all correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45, AS437
Libertyville, IL 60048


Hisashi D. Watanabe
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,465
Telephone: (847) 523-2322
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350

06/08/05
Date